

placing said angle-adjustment sleeve over the needle and into said adhesive for retention and support thereof by said hub member.

Claim 17 (amended)

[The] A method of [claim 15 wherein the method further includes the steps of:] fabricating a surgical needle assembly for endodontic procedures including the steps of:

providing a tubular shaft;

die cutting said shaft to provide a surgical needle of predetermined length;

machining one end of said needle to provide a skived portion of predetermined length;

providing a hub member having a cup-like interior;

supplying an autoclavable adhesive to the cup-like interior of said hub member; and

inserting the opposite end in said adhesive for retention and support thereof by said hub member;

providing an angle-adjustment sleeve;

positioning said angle-adjustment sleeve over said needle;

forming a pressure stressed connection between said angle-adjustment and said needle by deforming said angle-adjustment sleeve.

Claims 18 - 21 remain as originally presented.

Claim 22 (amended)

The needle assembly of claim 18, wherein the angle-adjustment sleeve is secured to said [hub member] needle using a pressure stressed connection.

Claim 23 remains as originally presented.

**REMARKS**

Applicant requests reconsideration of the above-mentioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and following discussion.


1. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Claim 5 has been deleted, without prejudice.
2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stropko (5,378,149). Claims 1, 3, 4, 13, and 14 have been deleted, without prejudice.

3. Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko. Claim 2 has been deleted, without prejudice.
4. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Okamoto et al (4,979,900). Claim 5 has been deleted, without prejudice.
5. Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Magovern et al (4,142,531). Claims 6 and 7 have been deleted, without prejudice.
6. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Fan et al (5,295,978). Claim 8 has been deleted, without prejudice.
7. Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Fan et al, and further in view of Magovern. Claim 9 has been deleted, without prejudice.
8. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Buchanan (5,752,825). Claims 10 and 11 have been deleted, without prejudice.
9. Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Riitano (6,079,979). Claim 12 has been deleted, without prejudice.
10. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Akhavi (4,240,423). Claim 15 has been deleted, without prejudice.
11. Claims 18 - 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stropko in view of Riitano. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. The Riitano reference discloses and claims a hub 22 having a neck 160 which may be selectively bent (col. 8, ln. 65, and Figure 7). This is unlike the present application, which discloses and claims an angle-adjustment sleeve surrounding a portion of the needle. The hub of the present invention encapsulates and grippingly supports one end of the needle, however the inclusion of an angle adjustment sleeve is unlike that disclosed by the Riitano reference. The Riitano reference discloses a hub member that may be selectively bent to thereby position the needle. In contrast, the present invention contemplates a device wherein the needle itself may be bent by use of an angle adjustment sleeve surrounding a portion of the needle. This arrangement is neither disclosed nor claimed in the Riitano reference. Accordingly, it is respectfully asserted that claims 18 - 21, inclusive, amended claim 22 and claim 23, present patentable subject matter and avoid the Riitano reference. Claim 22 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

12. Claims 16 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 16 and 17 have been rewritten according to the examiner's suggestion and are now believed to be allowable as such.

Applicant respectfully requests that the objections and rejections be removed, that amended claims 16, 17 and 22, and claims 18 - 21, inclusive and claim 23, be passed to allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

By   
John M. Manion and Reg. No. 38,957

RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C.  
Post Office Box 26618  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226  
(262) 783 - 1300  
9 May 2002  
Inter-Med/16408-CIP/020009 Amst. A

Enclosures: Amendment Transmittal  
Clean set of claims  
Return post card